

Descriptions of Types of Tasks

Rhode Island Skills Commission

Explanation and Considerations for Use

The Rhode Island Skills Commission developed this document. It describes tasks designed for different purposes and discusses differences between these tasks in terms of standards, teacher directions, student directions, prompts, and other task characteristics. The document also describes the rigor required of any task that will eventually serve as a valid entry in a student's graduation portfolio.

This tool was created and/or compiled by The Rhode Island Department of Education and The Education Alliance at Brown University, with the generous support of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/highschoolreform/dslat/>
October, 2005



**Portfolio Toolkit | Develop Entries |
Description of Portfolio Entries**

Descriptions of Kinds of Tasks

This table shows the many differences that separate tasks as they are used for different purposes with different groups of students. The different kinds of tasks are all useful components of a school-wide assessment system. In a healthy school-wide assessment system, individual teachers develop and use tasks that meet less stringent conditions than the tasks they would develop as an academic department, an instructional team, a subject-alike group, or other group to assess student learning towards more commonly help goals. However, tasks developed for classroom use can be revised so they meet the more stringent requirements of intra and inter school use. And, tasks that have been developed for intra and inter school use can be used for classroom purposes without following the protocols for administration and scoring.

Components	Tasks for Classroom Use	Tasks for department, school Use	Tasks for PBGR Use (“Common Tasks”)
Purpose	Provide useful and accurate information for guiding, refocusing, & differentiating instruction	Ensure fair, accurate, & useful assessments for all students, Detect missing opportunities to learn, Hold teachers accountable to instructing the curriculum, GSEs, Satisfy 50% performance based end of course exams, Practice for PBGR tasks and state assessments	Create credible (valid and reliable) evidence that students have developed proficiencies required for graduation, Anchor other school assessments, Create portfolio entries
Standards, expectations, targets	What students have been taught, Classroom targets for learning (proximal development), Course outcomes or benchmarks	School learner outcomes, content standards (nationally based or referenced)	NECAP GSEs, Applied learning expectations, Content standards (nationally based or referenced)
Teacher directions	Unwritten, based on teacher practice	Written and/or oral, uniform across all teachers	Written directions (meet written criteria for coverage and clarity)
Student directions	Written or oral, informal & interactive	Written & oral	Written directions (meet written criteria for coverage and clarity), Explained and discussed by teacher
Prompt	Written or oral	Written, possibly accompanied by explanation	Written (meets written criteria for interest, difficulty, bias, accessibility and clarity), Modified as appropriate

**Portfolio Toolkit | Develop Entries |
Description of Portfolio Entries**

Differences Between Kinds of Common Tasks (continued)

Components	Classroom Use	Department, school use	PBGR use
Task criteria	Task content and presentation is appropriate to entire class	Task covers content all teachers agree to teach, task is in a format all students are familiar with, modifications are appropriately provided	Task meets explicit criteria for alignment, fairness, bias, accessibility, usefulness, etc.
Quality control process	Implicit standards & notions of appropriateness	Implicit and explicit guidelines for what makes a task fair, useful, accessible, Tasks developed by faculty or representative group	Trained task developers, calibrators, scorers Explicit guidelines for task development, administration, scoring, etc. Training for teachers in task development, calibration, scoring, etc. Quality checks built into task developmental process (self-review and peer review)
Follow-up	Revised & refocused instruction	Revised & refocused instruction Teacher professional development Curriculum development and revision, Common planning time focused by results, Departmental meetings to reflect on results	Revised & refocused instruction Teacher Professional development Curriculum development and revision, Common planning time focused by results, Departmental meetings to reflect on results
Evaluation	Based on teacher judgment, criteria sheet, teacher developed rubric	Common rubric used by all teachers, Calibration: agreement on rubric and applications within department or across school, Acceptable evidence of accurate/agreement in scoring (start with Skills model)	Rubric checked against criteria, formal calibration, Benchmark work, Process checks on inter-scorer agreement, Scoring notes from previous scoring sessions, Blind scoring